DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 760 CS 502 412

AUTHOR Leenhouts, Thelma K.
TITLE Sex Differences in Political Communication: A Study of Female and Male State Legislators.
PUB DATE Nov 78
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (64th, Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 2-5, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Skills; Females; *Legislators; Males; *Politics; Research; Sex (Characteristics); *Sex Differences; *Sex Role; State Government
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Research

ABSTRACT

In an investigation of the communication similarities and differences between male and female legislators, the nine female representatives in the Michigan House of Representatives were matched with nine male representatives on four variables: political party, length of legislative service, district represented, and race. The representatives were interviewed at length about their communication in four areas: the allocation of communication time, floor debate, committee deliberation, and constituent communication. Interviews were also held with secretaries, committee aides and clerks, legislative staff, and members of the press. Other information was secured through observation of both floor debates and committee meetings and through reading and representatives' mailings, newsletters, press releases, daily calendars, and constituent mail. The findings revealed that male and female representatives were similar in all four communication areas. The differences that did emerge were, in most cases, attributable to the four variables, especially length of service and district represented, rather than to the sex variable. In general, the findings seemed to indicate that a resocialization process occurred for female representatives. The longer they served, the more their communication behavior became similar to male behavior. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED166760

Sex Differences in Political Communication:

A Study of Female and Male State Legislators

Presented at the
Speech Communication Association
Convention
Minneapolis, MN
November 5, 1978

Thelma K. Leenhouts
Department of Speech
University of Wisconsin-
Eau Claire

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thelma K. Leenhouts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CS502412

SEX DIFFERENCES IN POLITICAL COMMUNICATION:
A STUDY OF FEMALE AND MALE STATE LEGISLATORS

In 1974, a record number of women ran for political offices.[1] One hundred and ten women ran for Congress, an increase of twenty-four percent over 1972 and seventy four percent over 1970.[2] On the state level, thirteen women ran for governor, thirteen for lieutenant governor, forty-five for other state offices, and 1,007 for the state legislature[3] This shift on the part of large numbers of women from women's traditional volunteer role in support of male candidates to running for political office themselves resulted in 1974 being referred to as "the year of the woman" in American politics.[4]

Currently, about 900 women hold office at the state or national levels.[5] Of these, 685 serve in the state legislatures, up from 470 in 1974, bringing the total representation by women to eight percent of the total of about 7,600 state legislators.[6] The number of women holding elected office has increased by a third during each election of the past six years, an increase which is expected to continue over the next fifteen or so years.[7]

Much attention has been directed recently to the changing role of women in many areas of society, and with more and more women running for and being elected to political office, interest in the role of women in politics is increasing. Now that women in elected offices are more numerous than in the past, researchers have begun to look at the ways in which males and females in political office differ. Research which has been done on the kind of woman entering politics suggests both similarities and differences between men and women in politics.[8] However, little attention has been paid to possible differences in communication performance and style between males and females in legislative positions. Evidence of male-female com-

munication differences does exist, especially in the area of group communication behavior.[9] Yet, research concerned with communication patterns in legislatures, including floor debate, interpersonal relations, and decision-making, has shown no interest in the investigation of sex differences in communication.[10]

Most study of the communication behavior of political elites has been limited to political campaigns of males or the speech-making of male politicians at the national level. A survey of the national and regional speech communication journals published between 1967 and 1973 found fifty-four articles dealing with some aspect of a contemporary national political campaigns.[11] Almost half of these had an analysis of a candidate's specific message as the primary focus.[12] The studies concentrate on male politicians at the national level and show no interest in the communication of female politicians or in differences in communication between male and female political elites. Those studies of the speaking of women have been historical or biographical in nature, with no differences in communication behavior between male and female political elites.[13]

The increase in the number of women elected to political office, especially in state legislatures, makes such an investigation now possible. Thus, this study will concern itself with the communication behavior of women in political office and the ways in which it is similar to or different from the communication of males in political office. The Michigan House of Representatives, numbering nine women among its 110 members, the highest number ever elected to the Michigan legislature, was selected for this study of communication similarities and differences. Three of the women, all members of the minority party, are serving their first term. Of the remaining six women, members of the majority party, one is a first-termer, the others having

served several terms.

The decision to study women in the state legislature rather than on the local or federal level was made with several factors in mind. Unlike political office-holding at the local level, the state legislature provides an excellent opportunity to observe women as participants in decision-making that has significance for a great number of people. Although a study of women in Congress would provide this opportunity as well, it is in the state legislature that women are "sufficiently numerous that they can be studied not as idiosyncratic actors, but as examples of a class."[14]

Kirkpatrick, author of an extensive study on female state legislators, provides further justification for studying women in the state legislature; "Men dominate state legislatures as they dominate other political institutions in this and other societies. But women have served in state legislatures since 1921 and although they have constituted only five to ten percent of state legislators, they are sufficiently numerous to provide a useful perspective on the kinds of women who make a commitment to political life, the kinds of circumstances that facilitiate such commitments, the kinds of special problems encountered by women in political life and the modes of adaptation available to them."[15]

The specific purpose of this study was to investigate the communication similarities and differences between the male and female representatives of the Michigan House of Representatives in four areas: (1) the allocation of communication time; (2) floor debate; (3) committee deliberation; and (4) constituent communication. The nine female members of the Michigan House of Representatives were matched with nine male members on four variables: political party, length of service in the legislature, district represented, and race. Efforts were made to interview at length these eighteen representa-

tives about their communication in the four areas previously listed. Although one of the female representatives put off and finally refused the writer, interviews were conducted with the seventeen remaining legislators. Interviews were also held with secretaries, committee aides, committee clerks, House staff of both parties, and members of the press to gain additional information. Other information was secured through observation of both floor debate and committee meetings and the perusal of the representatives' newsletters, mailings, press clippings, press releases, daily calendar and, in some cases, constituent mail.

The analysis of the data found the male and female representatives to be quite similar in all four areas investigated. The differences which did emerge, in most cases, were attributable to the four variables on which the representatives were paired rather than to the sex variable. However, there is some evidence that sex role differences do account for some of the communication differences which appear.

Review of the Findings

Allocation of communication time

Both males and females rank constituent communication as the area to which they devote a major portion of their time. The women rank committee deliberation slightly higher than the males, with little difference between women chairing and those not chairing committees. Those males not chairing committees ranked committee deliberation slightly lower than male committee chairmen. Informal communication for females is largely with members of her own party and within the Capitol, whereas for males there is a greater tendency for it to occur across party lines and in social settings. Both males and

females rank communication with staff in a similar manner, below informal communication but higher than floor debate and communication with lobbyists.

Floor debate is generally ranked quite low but slightly higher by males than females. Observation of sessions of the House showed that only two of the representatives in the sample, both male, participated frequently in debate. Communication with lobbyists is also ranked generally low by both males and females. However, males seem to be sought out by lobbyists due to their greater influence in the House more than women who, as a group, had a more negative attitude toward lobbyists than males.

Floor Debate

Each representative was asked how often he/she participated in floor debate and his/her perception of the activity recorded. In addition, several of the House clerks and the Clerk of the House, who are present at every session of the legislature, were asked to rate the level of participation of the representatives in the sample as they observed it. The representatives' self-perception was then compared with that of the outside observers.

Men appear to participate more frequently in floor debate than women, both according to their own perceptions and the rating of observers, though the difference is not a major one.

Committee deliberation

An analysis of the position of the female representatives in the committee structure of the Michigan House found no women on the most powerful committees, Taxation and Appropriations. Women in the past have served on Taxation, but none have ever served on the Appropriations committee. Males generally seem to be appointed to the more important committees, where the numbers of bills

sent to each committee is the measure of "importance." The degree of participation in committees for males and females is quite similar to their participation in floor debate.

Each of the six female members of the majority party does chair a committee. Female leadership of committees runs the gamut from the tightly controlled committees of the inexperienced to the more democratic, yet controlled, committees of those more experienced. As security in one's position as chairperson increases and the need to prove one's authority decreases, females operate committees in ways more similar to male chairmen. Differences which do emerge are the tendency (1) of male members to be less harsh on and more accepting and respectful of a female chairperson and (2) for women to run more strongly controlled committees than males.

Constituent communication

The men and women seem to make an equal number of appearances in their districts. Both men and women make frequent appearances and both men and women make few appearances in their districts. The types of groups the representatives meet with are determined more by one's party and district than one's sex. Democrats from large cities speak most often to block clubs and neighborhood groups whereas Republicans, from both rural districts and suburbs, speak to school-related groups and Chambers of Commerce. The one sex-related difference which does emerge is that the women representatives, especially the first-term females, speak more often to women's groups than do the men.

Of the entire sample, two women issued the most press releases, but women also issued the least number. No clearly sex-related pattern emerges. In the

writing of newspaper columns there is also no sex-related difference but a party and district-related one. Five of the six first-term Republicans write newspaper columns. No sex difference emerges either in the number of newsletters sent out to the district. At least two-thirds of each sex do send newsletters. There also seems to be little difference between the men and women in the number of special mailings done. Of those who tape weekly radio programs, two are male and one is female, all from similar districts, a district rather than sex-related difference. More women than men, though the difference is slight, handle most of the responses to constituent mail themselves. This does not mean that other assistance is not sought, such as the House staff for necessary research on complex problems, but that the representative herself does take the major responsibility for answering the mail.

Factors Accounting for Communication Similarities and Differences

As the findings suggest, most of the communication similarities and differences are explained by the four control variables, especially length of service and the district represented. After the effects of the four control variables are accounted for, some sex-related communication differences do emerge. Communication differences also emerge among the women themselves, explained chiefly by the four control variables, especially length of service. One will recall that of the nine women in the House, four are first-termers and the others have served at least six terms. The differences explained by both political party and race will be referred to in the discussion of the other two factors.

Length of Service

Constituent communication

Of the representatives who, unlike the majority of representatives, reported

that they did not allocate the greatest portion of their time to constituent communication, all but one have served several years in the legislature. Through their years in the legislature they have secured positions, such as chairmanships of committees, which place added legislative demands on them, reducing the amount of time available, and possibly, also their desire, for personal involvement in constituent communication. Also, because they have been re-elected many times, they have most likely established a relatively secure political base which now needs only maintenance. This seems to be the case as evidenced by the methods of communication with constituents used by the senior members. They appear to make fewer appearances in their districts, but rely on frequent district-wide newsletters and immediate, efficient response to constituent mail to keep their names before the voters and remind them of what the representative has done for them. Many of the senior members view their representative role as that of a "trustee" and thus communicate with constituents most often to explain decisions made or votes cast rather than to seek advice. The senior members in general, though there are exceptions, spend less personal time on constituent correspondence, using instead their personal staffs, which include at least a secretary and a committee aide, to handle it.

First-termers, on the other hand, with one exception, all rank constituent communication first. They are still in the process of establishing a firm political base, and thus make frequent appearances in their districts, males and females alike. Although some do not send district-wide newsletters, most, several of whom are Republican, send many special mailings during the year to various constituent groups both to gain and maintain support. Since many of the first-termers view their representative role as that of a "delegate," much of their communication

with constituents seems motivated by the need to seek information and advice from constituents to guide them in their decision-making though, obviously, many of the mailings done are also to inform constituents. Also, as a first-termer, one's influence in the House is often only minimal, and since the responsibilities and demands which come with leadership positions are not present, the first-termer often chooses to devote himself/herself to constituent matters where he/she can have an impact.

Communication with lobbyists

Another area where length of service affects communication is communication with lobbyists. Lobbyists seek out only those who have influence with other legislators in certain areas of expertise. Most often, though not always, committee chairpersons are the individuals often sought out by lobbyists. All the senior members in the sample chair committees and, because of this position and subsequent influence, are sought out more often by lobbyists than are first-termers, who, in this case, are members of the minority party, giving them even less influence. The first-termers, rather than being sought out by the lobbyists, seek them out, often using them as information sources when explanations of the implications bills are needed.

Communication with staff

Senior members, both male and female, were found to communicate less with the House staff than do the first-termers. Because no staff existed when many of the senior representatives were first elected, they became accustomed to handling most of their work themselves, and now most of them call on the staff rarely, preferring to have their personal staff handle most matters. The first-termers, on the other hand, make extensive use of the House staff, increasing the potential for communication with them.

Floor Debate

Generally, senior representatives participated more actively in floor debate than freshmen, though one freshman male did participate frequently. Many senior members, because of the expertise they have gained through their years in the legislature and subsequent influence upon and respect of their colleagues on these matters, are prompted to participate often. Senior members chair committees and speak most often when bills from their committees are being acted on. Many freshmen have not yet established an area of expertise and most have introduced few bills. Therefore, they have less reason to speak than the senior representatives.

Type of District

The influence of the type of district represented on communication is most often evident in the area of constituent communication. Most of the representatives serving similar districts engage in similar types of communication with their constituents. Those from urban areas, most of whom in the sample are Democrats, speak most often to block clubs, whereas those from rural areas or suburbs speak most often to school groups, service clubs, and Chambers of Commerce. In addition, black representatives speak more often to black groups and also to church groups, reflecting the importance of the institutionalized church in black urban districts. Those from rural areas or suburbs issue more press releases than those in urban areas and also make more use of radio on a regular basis. Also, those from urban areas, several of whom are black, receive more constituent mail consisting of social service complaints and requests for assistance than those from areas where the residents are of a higher economic status and more highly educated. This latter group receives more mail concerning specific legislation.

Male-female communication differences

Not all of the communication similarities and differences which occurred can be explained by the four variables of length of service, type of district represented, political party and race. Some male-female communication differences did emerge. These are not biologically-determined sex differences but the result of the process by which both males and females have been socialized, causing males and females alike to have certain expectations of female behavior. The women presently in the legislature have already dealt with and overcome many of these socialized expectations in running for and being elected to the position of state representative, a position traditionally a male one. However, learned notions of appropriate female behavior remain and affect the ways in which the women communicate. The major areas of communication differences were participation in floor debate and in committees, the chairing of committees, informal communication, communication with lobbyists, and constituent groups spoken to. These differences are attribute chiefly to traditional standards of female behavior and the expectation women have of the responses of men and of other women to their behavior.

Floor debate. The women's communication behavior, especially in floor debate and in committee deliberation, is greatly influenced by their perception that, as women, their behavior must not conform to any negative aspects of the female stereotype, such as talking too often or too long. This perception is more true of the first-term women than of the senior ones, however. The first-termers specifically mention that they are careful not to speak too often on the floor of the House, speaking only when they feel strongly on an issue. As with first-term males, their participation in floor debate is tempered by the fact that few of their own bills or ones from the committees on which they serve are being discussed. but unlike the males, their participation is affected additionally

by the perception that, as women, their communication behavior will elicit responses quite different from similar communication behavior of males.

The senior women do not express such a concern and it does not seem to play a part in whether or not they participate in debate. For them, participation is determined more often by whether or not their own bills or ones from the committees they chair are being discussed. Since, generally, they introduce fewer bills than the senior males in the sample, their participation in debate is also slightly less than males'.

Committee deliberation. Compared with their participation in floor debate, females show an increased level of participation in committees. The experience of females prior to election may better prepare them for the informal communication of committees than the more formal floor debate, making them more comfortable communicating in the smaller committees than speaking before the large body of representatives on the floor of the House. Unlike most males, who had full-time occupations in business or law prior to election which provided them with the experience of speaking before large as well as small groups, many of the females lacked such experience; they were either housewives or held only part-time jobs.

Another reason prompting increased activity in committee for the female is that in committee she has more opportunity to discuss legislation related to her area of expertise. Most of the males serve on committees which report out more bills to the floor of the House than the committees on which females serve and sponsor more bills than the females, which provide males with more of an opportunity and reason to engage in floor debate than females. In committees, the activity of females increases because bills related to their interests and expertise are more often discussed there than on the floor, also giving them a greater chance for influence.

Women also participate more in committees because they, as women, need to work harder than men and communicate in a much more conscientious way, such as making sure they have adequate support for their positions, in order to enhance their credibility and gain the respect of their colleagues.

Committee leadership. Males perceived the women chairpersons as more dogmatic, didactic, and dictatorial than they, and as running more strongly controlled committees. However, most of the female chairpersons did not perceive any differences between themselves and the male chairpersons. The senior females, in most ways, do chair committees very similarly to male chairmen; however, on the whole, the females' committees are more strongly controlled. The chairmanship of a committee is the highest leadership position many of these women will have or aspire to, and thus they may exert more control in the committee to firmly establish their positions and influence. As chairpersons, they have control over the legislation which comes before the committee and the action taken. The committee provides them with one of their greatest opportunities for influence on legislation and the stronger control exerted over the committee may be an attempt to increase that influence.

Not only do males perceive the communication behavior of female chairpersons to be different from their own, but they behave toward women in a different manner than toward males. They tend to be less harsh on and more accepting and respectful of a female chairperson because She is female. Although some males state that a woman should get respect because she is a capable legislator not because she is a women, many of the males continue to view the women legislators as objects of somewhat more deference because they are women. Some of the women accept this

behavior as appropriate male behavior toward a female. Others view it as an obstacle which keeps them from gaining the respect of males as capable legislators, and realize that, as females, they must work even harder to gain the desired respect.

Informal communication. Informal communication with colleagues is affected by the female representatives' notions of appropriate behavior. Most of the informal communication of females was found to stay within their own party and within the Capitol itself, whereas the men engaged in it more often, across party lines, and often in social settings. A woman representative, especially a senior one, would see socializing alone with a male representative as totally unacceptable given the way she was socialized. Meeting with a group of males at a local bar would not be considered appropriate behavior for a female either, not because it would be thought immoral, but because it might indicate an inappropriate adoption of conventionally masculine behavior. Thus, females traditionally have confined their informal interactions with colleagues to the legislative setting. However, some change in standards was noted here in the behavior of one first-term woman. She was reported to have been part of a group of males, also first-termers and with similar political philosophies, who met regularly at the home of one of the males. In addition, she also frequently went "out for a drink with the boys" following the evening legislative session. If one can generalize from one example, this representative seems to represent a type of female legislator different from those elected several years ago. She sees a value in frequent informal communication with colleagues in a variety of settings, a value which many males share, and she apparently succeeded in overcoming barriers that previously limited such interaction.

Communication with lobbyists. Several women chair committees and one would would expect lobbyists to seek them out as individuals who have influence with other legislators in certain areas of expertise. However, males more than females appear to be sought out more by lobbyists. The females chair committees but do not chair as important ones as males and are not as influential with their colleagues. One female does chair an important committee, and, in this instance, lobbyists often seek her out.

More women than men report a negative attitute toward lobbyists, which would also decrease the amount of communication between women and lobbyists. Several of the women pride themselves on their freedom from the demand of lobbyists, and if they do communicate with them, do so on limited occasions to secure information on the implications of legislation.

Women's groups. Women, especially first-term women, speak more often than men to women's groups but not to the exclusion of all-male groups, such as service clubs. That women speak much more frequently to women's groups suggests a special obligation they feel as women. They are motivated to reach other women in the state, not only to provide them with role models, but also an open line of communication to state government. In the past many problems women wanted addressed were met with opposition from a legislature with women too few in number to help. Many of the women in the present legislature, however, are actively seeking input from women on the issues of concern to them and sponsoring legislation designed to solve these problems.

Communication differences among females

In addition to the communication differences between males and females, communication differences also exist among the female legislators themselves. Four of the females are first-termers and the other five have all served at least six terms. The differences which emerge are

chiefly a result of this difference in length of service and also different perceptions of acceptable female behavior.

Committee deliberation. In committees, the first-term women feel that, as women, they need to work harder than men and communicate in a much more conscientious way to gain the respect of their colleagues. The senior women seem to see no difference between their behavior and that of males. At least two explanations for these differences between the first-term and senior women seem possible. The first-term women may feel insecure in their new roles as legislators in a male-dominated environment and thus push themselves to work even harder to be effective and accepted members. In the minds of these women, a woman does have to excel to gain recognition from male colleagues. Senior women who have served several years, whose positions are relatively secure, and who have gained the acceptance they initially sought, have no need to feel that being a women has created any obstacles for them. They have achieved what they desired and feel they do operate in ways very similar to males.

A second explanation seems equally plausible. The first-termers are aware of the behavior of males toward females--that a woman is often shown deference because she is a female legislator who happens to be a woman--and are not misled by it into regarding it as anything more than politeness. Because they want respect as legislators, they perceive they must work even harder than the males to gain that respect. The senior women may not be aware of this male behavior toward them or are aware of it and accept it as the way males should behave toward women; obviously they do not feel it has lessened their effectiveness as legislators.

Committee leadership. The degree of security felt by a woman in her role as legislator in a man's world may also explain the difference between the ways in which females chair committees. One will recall that of the six women chairing committees, all but one, who is a first-termer, are serving at least their sixth term. While all were perceived by the males as running more strongly committees than men, the first-termer ran an especially formal and "tight" committee. She was unsure of herself and feared that the men on the committee would take it over. She maintained her control by strictly regulating the committee procedure, though committee effectiveness was significantly lessened. However, as she gained confidence in her role, she began to feel secure enough to allow for more flexibility and interaction in the meetings.

Three senior women, who have chaired the same committees for several years, show little, if any, evidence of insecurity in their roles and, according to the reports of several representatives, run their committees very similarly to those run by males The fact that these three women are seen by some of the males as more strongly controlling their committees than men, may be evidence that these women look on committees as one of the few places they can establish their authority and leadership position. For them, the committee chairpersonship is the highest leadership they will attain, and possibly, the slightly stronger control they exert over their committees serves to reinforce that position.

Aspirations. A difference in political aspirations between the first-term and senior women also accounts for communication differences among the females. A change seems to be taking place in the aspirations of the newly-elected women from those of the women elected several years ago. Generally, females' aspirations for political office or leadership positions within the House have not been as high as males'. But, where the senior female representatives are content with the positions they have, the first-termers actually seek

influence and positions of official leadership. None of the senior women even consider the position of Speaker of the House as a position to which women might aspire. However, two of the first term women specifically state that they see this as an acceptable goal for a female representative. One in particular, possibly representative of the "new" political woman, has set as her goal to become part of the leadership. She has sought out ways to begin to gain influence, such as being appointed to chair a committee and establishing relationships with colleagues through frequent informal communication. In the past, women have not aspired beyond chairing a committee. For this representative chairing a committee is only a first step to more influential positions.

In general, the findings seem to indicate that a re-socialization process occurs for the females in the legislature. The longer they serve, the more their communication behavior becomes similar to male behavior. To function in a male-dominated environment, women learn to adapt to existing communication patterns, which includes the acceptance of the males' notions of how a female should behave. The newly-elected females have views of acceptable female behavior which differ from those of the senior women. If re-socialization does occur, one could expect female communication behavior to become even more similar to the communicationbehavior of males.

Directions for Future Research and Predictions

Future research

Although this study has provided insight into communication similarities and differences between male and female representatives, many questions remain unanswered and serve as areas for future investigation. The communication behavior of males and females in committee seems a fruitful area for future research. A more systematic observation of committee interactions is needed,

such as tape recording committee meetings and coding the statements of committee members according to a category scheme similar to Bales' Interaction Process Analysis. Such observation could provide a check on male perceptions of female committee behavior: Are women more didactic? Do they run more strongly controlled committees? It could also provide a check on women's perceptions of their own behavior: Do they have support for all the statements they make? Do their statements differ from those made by males? If the committee provides females their greatest opportunity for influence, what specifically do they say to attempt to gain this influence? Since women are most active in committees, and since the researcher does have access to committee interaction, the committee is a prime place for continued analysis of male-female communication differences.

Male-female differences in communication with lobbyists is another area which needs more systematic investigation. None of the research on lobbying has looked at the interaction between lobbyist and representative in terms of sex differences. Women in the legislatures are now becoming numerous enough to warrant such study. Do lobbyists, who are mostly male, interact differently with females than with males? Under what circumstances do lobbyists seek out women? Under what circumstances do women legislators seek out lobbyists? Such investigation would provide a more complete picture of the lobbying process.

More study of newly-elected female representatives also seems in order. In this study, the first-termers differed from the senior members in several ways. Do these differences hold true for women in other state legislatures? If newly-elected females do have different aspirations and different perceptions of acceptable female behavior, how long do these persist? What is the impact

on communication in the legislature? At what point does the "re-socialization process" occur? Such research would increase the understanding of the role of women inpolitics today. If newly-elected women do represent an orientation to politics different from that of women who have served many years, they may also engage in different communication patterns.

Predictions

If the trend evident in recent elections continues, more and more women will run for and be elected to political office at all levels, especially the state legislature. The increased numbers cannot help but affect male-female interaction in the legislature, moving it toward more equality.

Judging from the change in aspirations of the newly-elected females in the Michigan legislature, women will no longer be content with roles which do not include them in major leadership positions. Not only will they aspire to positions such as Speaker of the House, but will attempt to move even faster and much harder for these leadership positions, taking advantage of the present climate and forces which cause women to seek equality in all fields. Higher aspirations undoubtedly will affect the patterns of communication as women seek to gain influence within the legislature.

Having women in elected positions, such as the women in the Michigan legislature, is important now and for the future. Not only are these women opening up the channels of communication between women and government, but they also serve as role models for women in American society, communicating through their achievements, that women can be successful and have an impact in the political arena at the state, and even national, levels.

Notes

[1]"'The Year of the Woman,'" Newsweek, November 4, 1974, p. 20.

[2]Susan and Martin Tolchin, Clout: Woman Power and Politics (New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, Inc., 1974), p. 29.

[3]Tolchin, Clout, p. 29.

[4]Newsweek, November 4, 1974, p. 20

[5]Detroit Free Press 18 January 1976, 3-C.

[6]Center for the American Woman and Politics, Women in Public Office: A Biographical Directory and Statistical Analysis (New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1976), p. xvii and New York Times 10 September 1977, 8:3.

[7]Detroit Free Press 18 January 1976, 3-C.

[8]See, for example, Emmy E. Werner, "Women in Congress: 1917-1964," The Western Political Quarterly 19 (1966), 16-30; Emmy E. Werner, "Women in State Legislatures," The Western Political Quarterly 21 (1968), 40-50; Edmond Costantini and Kenneth H. Craik, "Women as Politicians: The Social Background, Personality, and Political Careers of Female Party Leaders," Journal of Social Issues 28 (1972), 217-236; M. Kent Jennings and Norman Thomas "Men and Women in Party Elites: Social Roles and Political Resources," Midwest Journal of Political Science 12 (November, 1968), 469-492; Janet Feagans, "Female Political Elites: Case Studies of Female Legislators" Ph.D. dissertation, Howard University, 1972); Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Political Woman (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1974); Erika Garen King and Patricia Freeman, "Personality Characteristics of Women Party Elites and Their Impact on Political Style," paper presented at the Workshop on Women in Politics, Ann Arbor, Michigan Summer, 1975.

[9]John E. Baird, Jr., "Sex Differences in Group Communication: A Review of Relevant Research," Quarterly Journal of Speech 62 (April, 1976), 170-192.

[10]David Kovenock, "Influence in the U.S. House of Representatives: A Statistical Analysis of Communications," American Politics Quarterly 4 (October, 1973), 407-464; Robert G. Lehnen, "Behavior on the Senate Floor: An Analysis of Debate in the U.S. Senate," Midwest Journal of Political Science 11 (1967), 505-521; H. E. Knepprath, "Speech in the Legislative Process," Today's Speech 14 (November, 1966), 13 16; Stephen V. Monsma, "Interpersonal Relations in the Legislative System: A Study of the 1964 Michigan House of Representatives," Midwest Journal of Political Science 10 (August, 1966), 350-363.

[11]Judith S. Trent, "A Synthesis of Methodologies Used in Studying Political Communication," Central States Speech Journal 26 (Winter, 1975), 287-297.

[12]Jerry E. Mandel, "The Presentation of Image in Charles H. Percy's Whistle Stop Tour of 1966," Central States Speech Journal 21 (1970), 209-216; Robert O. Nordvold, "Rhetoric as Ritual: Hubert H. Humphrey's Acceptance Address at the 1968 Democrat National Convention," Today's Speech 18 (1970) 34-38; Robert Wayne Norton, "The Rhetorical Situation is the Message: Muskie's Election Eve Television Broadcast," Central States Speech Journal 21 (1971), 171-178; James G. Powell, "Reactions to JFK's Delivery Skills During the 1960 Campaign," Western Speech 32 (1968), 59-68.

[13]Alice Donaldson, "Women Emerge as Political Speakers," Speech Monographs 18 (March, 1951), 54-61; Mary W. Graham, "Margaret Chase Smith," Quarterly Journal of Speech 50 (December, 1964), 390-393; Kathleen Edgerton Kendall and Jeanne Y. Fisher, "Frances Wright on Women's Rights: Eloquence versus Ethos," Quarterly Journal of Speech (February, 1974), 58-67; Wil A.

Linkugel, "The Woman Suffrage Argument of Anna Howard Shaw," Quarterly Journal of Speech 49 (April, 1963), 165-174.

[14]Kirkpatrick, Political Woman, p. 21.

[15]Kirkpatrick, Political Woman, p. 22.